

THE NEW BATCH OF MAGISTRATES.

It seems but yesterday that some remarks under the above heading invited the attention of all who prized the welfare of this colony to a sudden, strange, and wanton attack on one of her most important safeguards. The Bench had been cumbered and degraded by the appointment of some six score magistrates, selected with a view to anything rather than their fitness to discharge their duties. A weak minister had placed his conscience in the hands of his least scrupulous supporters, and consented to be responsible for the respectability and education of a large number of persons, of the majority of whom it is charitable to believe that he knew absolutely nothing. We ventured at once to declare, that such a system of patronage was *destitute of all equity*—that it tended not to overthrow the Minister who had recourse to it, than to damage the country on which it was inflicted. On one part of this prediction it is now superfluous to dwell; already "the whiffing of time has brought in his revenges," and any future Premier, who may feel himself tempted to swamp the magistracy by a flood of illiterate partisans, will be checked by the warning record of Mr. Cowper's fall. But the injury which we foresaw, from that wholesale manufacture of worthless magistrates, has not yet shown itself, and we are already in a measure before the country. It may, however, be useful to indicate and comment on the symptoms already apparent—symptoms of a wide-spread mischief, which it was not difficult indeed to anticipate, but which it may tax the utmost wisdom of our legislators and the public to remedy.

In the first place, you cannot put fusion on broadcloth. The new nominees do not and cannot harmonise (especially in the country districts) with the older occupants of the Bench, men for the most part appointed on public grounds, and qualified by requirements and social position for the due discharge of their functions. The incongruous materials refuse to assimilate, and the result is, either an uneasy local struggle, or the loss of tried public servants, possibly both. Goulburn, Mudgee, Armidale, centres of population remote from the capital and from each other, and subject to different influences, are already violently agitated; nor do we doubt that, ere long, the country through its length and breadth, will feel how grievous a thing it is to bid ignorance sit in judgment, and discredit law in its most accessible administrators.

Aye marry, sir! now it begins to work.

It will be in the remembrance of our readers, that at Mudgee the whole bench of magistrates resigned rather than sit with a colleague whose elevation they were constrained to regard as a first sight seem objectionable, but it must be remembered that we are speaking of an *unpaid* magistracy. The members of such a body have much work, and much responsibility; nay, more, in a sense, they act at a heavy cost, for in a country where time is emphatically money, they give to their duties without a recompense, we may call golden-hour. For these sacrifices they are rewarded only by the dignity of their position, and by the opportunities of usefulness which it confers. The elevation of noisy nobodies to the Bench puts dignity out of the question—what could be honoured by sharing the consulate with CALIGULA's horse? And for usefulness, men of character and station must be allowed to judge for themselves how far they will be hindered from doing good service by the presence of coarse, ignorant, or quarrelsome interlopers; to say nothing of the cases (not, alas! imaginary) where men notoriously bankrupt in character, are those whom the Chief Secretary delights to honour. To judge calmly in such cases is no doubt difficult, nor are we familiar enough with details of provincial history to affirm that the protesting magistrates have in each case acted with perfect temper. Enough for us and for the public to know that great numbers of the new appointments were calculated to create disgust, as being both needless and injudicious, and that they did create it accordingly, much to the detriment of the local administration of justice.

But the resignation or protest of experienced magistrates is but the first act in this drama of mischief. It is too well known that in this colony agitation is a thriving trade, and never more thriving than where jobbery is to be supported or respectability assailed. So each objectionable appointment is no sooner impugned than up start a host of sympathisers, noisy and bitter of spirit, ready to drink confusion to all above them in the social scale, and maintain, to the last hiccup in their bodies, the divine rights of ignorance, and the due subordination of the head to the heels.

His Excellency the Governor General is assured by hazardous position, that the magistrate who can find no gentleman to sit with him is the only genuine article, and the rest all counterfeit—that the tree of justice was unscathed throughout, until the sudden appearance of the last fungus on its surface. All this might well be laughed at, were it not for the false notions which it is calculated to engender and propagate. There could be no greater misfortune for this country than that the working classes should be deluded into distrusting the judicial impartiality of men high in social position—should imagine that what is farthest above them must needs be against them. Such a delusion must tend to set class against class, and to taint the administration of justice by mixing it with personal feeling. Men of education and independent mind will decline to act when they find their decisions suspected; and there may arise a popular clamour, for low and illiterate magistrates men who cannot expound law, because they know nothing of it, and who will not do justice because the very condition of their popularity makes them partisans. Such a state of things, happily, has not yet arisen; but if we escape it, our escape will be due to the general good sense of the people, and not to our late Premier, his advisers, or his nominees. And when we look at the state of political parties, we cannot but recognise a great and growing necessity for placing the appointment of magistrates in different hands, or, at all events, giving to our Judges a controlling veto.

Meanwhile, there is a very pretty quarrel on foot, and the waters of bitterness are being let out freely through the channel of provincial correspondence. It is some consolation, however, that the worst of the newly-made judges are, ere long, to bring themselves into contempt of odium, and thereby diminish their own power of mischief. One worthy has already commenced a crusade against the local press, in which we "rather calculate" he will reap more bad knocks than laurels. "Sitting alone," like Tennyson's mermaid bold, he will read more bad knocks than laurels. "Sitting alone," like Tennyson's mermaid bold, he will read more bad knocks than laurels.

of an unoffending reporter. As the readers of the *Herald* have already seen the record of Mr. Baker's judicial triumphs—his singular ideas of magisterial dignity—his original notions of examination without a charge, condemnation without evidence, and forcible ejection without cause or warrant, we will spare superfluous comment. Such proceedings work their own cure by their exquisite absurdity.

So let us, long live the Press!

And when he next doth make a mess, May I be there to see!

SPECTATOR.

L.A.W.

SUPREME COURT.—WEDNESDAY.
Sittings for the Trial of Causes.
JURY COURT.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE DICKINSON and a jury of four.
James v. Mott.
This was an action for money had and received, &c., to which the defendant had pleaded the general issue, and a set-off—the real question being as to the legality of certain charges in a mercantile account. Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff, and Mr. Stephen for the defendant.

The plaintiff and defendant were both foreigners. The defendant had left the colony, but the plaintiff was examined as a witness in the case. The amount in question was only £20 10s. Plaintiff having assigned some goods to defendant, had himself arrived in Sydney soon afterwards. He had paid defendant's account for his services in the colony, and his right assignment, but with a distinct reservation of his right to object to any of its items which he might, after enquiry, consider open to such objection. When the objections forming the subject matter of the present action were raised, defendant took no notice of them, nor would he accede to plaintiff's offer of arbitration. The alleged overcharges were mostly on items for commission, but there was one of £9 10s. for the services of a discharging clerk. This was resisted, upon the ground that the clerk was not himself on the spot, and looking to the discharge of his goods, no such charge was permissible. There had been no special contract, and the decision of this point depended upon the evidence of the witnesses as to the custom of the port, the charge was a proper one. This evidence, as well as that in reference to some other parts of the case, was conflicting. The action was first commenced in the District Court, but before it could be tried that Court had been abolished and the District Courts not called into existence. As defendant was about to leave the colony, the action was consequently to be transferred to the Supreme Court.

His Honor having summed up, the jury found a verdict for the plaintiff, damages £19 10s. 8d.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
Allen v. Graham.
In this action the plaintiff sought to recover damages for defamation of character. The declaration, in effect, stated that the plaintiff (Thomas Allen) was a commission agent carrying on business in Sydney (King-street); that in such business he had large dealings with persons in the district of Wollongong; and that the defendant (James Graham) was a publisher of the plaintiff in the district of Wollongong the words following:—"He is insolvent circumstances, and he is about to turn insolvent"—whereby the plaintiff lost his customers and was damaged in his good name and reputation.

The defendant pleaded not guilty. Mr. Isaacs, Mr. Dalley, and Mr. Wild appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Davell, Q.C., for the defendant.

On the behalf of the plaintiff, the witness was called, and that after that time, certain customers had ceased to continue their dealings with the plaintiff, and that the defendant had been a witness to it. It appeared that there was some doubt whether two of these customers had not left the plaintiff previously. It was proved that the words complained of had been addressed to old friends of the defendant, and that the defendant had been a witness to it. No witnesses were called for the defence, it being contended that the communication was privileged, and that there was no malice on the part of the defendant. The judge, in giving judgment, said that the words were spoken to old friends who had an interest in the solvency of the plaintiff, the defendant was justified in stating what he had heard. The defendant was himself a customer of the plaintiff, and was entitled to speak the words. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

HOLLAND v. RICHARDSON.
In this action the plaintiff sought to recover damages for the negligence of the defendant, a driver of one of the New South Wales omnibuses, in upsetting the omnibus on which the plaintiff was a passenger. The defendant by his plea denied that the omnibus was overturned, and that the plaintiff was injured, and also that he was not guilty as alleged.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff—Mr. Faure for the defendant.

From the evidence it appeared that, on the evening of the 24th of February last, the omnibus in question called the *Norval*, was plying between Sydney and Newcastle, and the plaintiff took his place outside at the rear of the omnibus. The driver, who was his servant, and also that he was not guilty as alleged.

The omnibus was overturned, and the plaintiff was injured. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

no difference between a suit on a promissory note and any other suit, rendering it safe, for the plaintiff to be absent when the cause is called on. If the defendant were to swear falsely that the signature of the maker was a forgery, and the plaintiff were to present to deny this, he would probably lose his action.

I must dismiss this application, with costs, but the case is so much impeded, with reference to the proper working of the District Courts, that I should be glad if it were taken before the full Court.

JURY COURT.—WEDNESDAY.
James v. Mott.
This was an action for money had and received, &c., to which the defendant had pleaded the general issue, and a set-off—the real question being as to the legality of certain charges in a mercantile account. Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff, and Mr. Stephen for the defendant.

The plaintiff and defendant were both foreigners. The defendant had left the colony, but the plaintiff was examined as a witness in the case. The amount in question was only £20 10s. Plaintiff having assigned some goods to defendant, had himself arrived in Sydney soon afterwards. He had paid defendant's account for his services in the colony, and his right assignment, but with a distinct reservation of his right to object to any of its items which he might, after enquiry, consider open to such objection. When the objections forming the subject matter of the present action were raised, defendant took no notice of them, nor would he accede to plaintiff's offer of arbitration. The alleged overcharges were mostly on items for commission, but there was one of £9 10s. for the services of a discharging clerk. This was resisted, upon the ground that the clerk was not himself on the spot, and looking to the discharge of his goods, no such charge was permissible. There had been no special contract, and the decision of this point depended upon the evidence of the witnesses as to the custom of the port, the charge was a proper one. This evidence, as well as that in reference to some other parts of the case, was conflicting. The action was first commenced in the District Court, but before it could be tried that Court had been abolished and the District Courts not called into existence. As defendant was about to leave the colony, the action was consequently to be transferred to the Supreme Court.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages one farthing.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MILLER and a jury of four.
John v. John.
This was an action for the recovery of a horse, and for the recovery of the price of the horse. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had stolen the horse, and that he was entitled to recover the price of the horse. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Isaacs appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Faure for the defendant.

The jury returned a

14400

[illegible]

(From the Daily News, September 19.)

ARRIVALS.—NOVEMBER 12.

[illegible]

EVA	
Mean	Mode

What will surprise many readers most, on reading Mr. Maitland's pamphlet, will be the apparent tone of out-and-out democracy which pervades it. As an old squatter, who has left the colony and grinded his ambition by getting into the British Parliament, what might be expected to have feared, if not a slight, at least a conservative tone in his advice. Instead, he makes a cautious recommendation against violent action, and in favour of the present mode of the Convention in his rear. Mr. Maitland talks like a Tory in comparison to him. He desires to conserve the law, and distrusts the people. He would give to every man as much land as he ever he can make use of, without doing anything to mean us to ask for any payment. This sort of

...a political opponents.

The adaptation of this colony for the production of the wool of the alpaca may be now considered settled. The late observations, however, on special facts, shows that the expectations formed were not unfounded. The fleece, in quality, in weight, and therefore in mercantile value, warrants the belief that we shall find it among our largest and most precious exports.

The colony has thus largely gained—Mr. LEITCH is rearing the stock, but is separated from his children, who are in South America. We have seen that he is anxious to return to them after seven years' wanderings, and thus his adventure will to him be without any beneficial result, for the advantage of having added to the wealth of the Australian colonies.

Will the gentlemen of this colony permit Mr. LEITCH to leave these shores sheepy-handed?

even to bear the ins

[illegible]

ke. tailor. Oculburn at

FATAL CONSEQUENCE.—It has been noted in this City Center that two sadistic draths have occurred in a place called Dr. O'Hern's Farm, England. The first was the death of a boy on the bed with his children, when he leaped that another had been taken from his arms. The second was the death of a man, which was drowned, on her return his body was found. The other died in bed. The circumstances were related after somewhat strange; it is for the coroner will investigate them.

Gigs, Carriages, Deparia,
Shark and Leading Harn

[illegible]

100-443887-100

... prudent to land, we shoved off the boat to the
surroundings. They then rushed into the water at

voyagers; and it was settled that H. H. Stephenson is to go in Daft's place.—*Illustrated News*.

ly deeply impressed with what they had witnessed, separated with sad and mournful countenances.—
Western Times.

But then why invade England? France
so has been invaded, not by a single army, but
the whole of Europe. Is she now less strong, less
great, less feared?

widespread, a downright hostility to this
one of a nature to find vent even
invasion. It broke out into out-
pression on the occasion of the attent-

take their trial for uttering. Trindall committed for forging, and Collins for uttering the same prisoners were further charged with forging £5 note, at the house of Julia Muppheth, but remanded till Friday.--*Northern*

<http://nla.gov.au/nla.news>



al Library

[The page contains extremely faint, illegible text impressions.]

18

BOARDING, with board, for two friends, respectable, near the docks, 269, Clarence-street, three doors from Drury-street.

BOARD AND RESIDENCE in a private family, pleasantly situated. Mr. PALMER, 9, Henrietta-street.

BOARD AND RESIDENCE—Two Vacancies, separate apartments, in Mr. GANS, 185, Prince-st., Clarendon Hill, one guinea; private family, 1/2, Liverpool-st. East.

BOARD AND RESIDENCE, with every comfort. Mrs. ELDERS, 24, Castlereagh-street, near Market.

PAINAIN—Two Gentlemen can be accommodated from 1/2 to 1/3. **BOARD, &c.** in a private family, with frugal, with every convenience of a private life. Apply A. S., Box 105, Post Office.

PAINAIN EAST—**do** Let, in Nicholson-street, a **COLOMBAGE RESIDENCE**, with luncheon &c. view—very convenient for the situation. Mr. George MURPHY, 10, St. George's-street, near the Custom-house, having eight rooms, garden, paddock, and the magnificent view of the city, and the sea, and the Custom-house, respectable family. Rent low. Enquire of RAMSAY, grocer, near the Custom-house.

PAINAIN EAST—**do** Let, a pleasant **COTTAGE**, within five minutes' walk of the Royal Custom-house, quite new, painted and papered throughout, with a garden. All necessaries in plenty, of garden goods, and a wall of excellent wall. Rent low. Enquire of RAMSAY, grocer, near the Custom-house. Apply at the next cottage, or to Dr. MACMILLAN, &c., 24, St. George's-street, near the Custom-house.

COTTAGES to Let, in Agency for Mr. RUSSELL, grocer, 40, Nittler's Place.

FURNISHED APARTMENTS to Let, 35, Upper Port-street, Finghall, with or without furniture.

FURNISHED HOUSES, well situated at the top of the hill, near the station, and close to the terminus. Apply at once to F. GARLAND MYRLA, Exchange.

HOUSE to LET, enquire of E. CURTIS, Pympton, No. 340, George-street.

FURNISHED HOUSES, with a lady and gentleman, and a small family, enquire of Mr. J. H. MACQUEEN, 2nd North. No other inquiries kept.

HOUSE to LET, BE LET TWO DWELLINGS, Lyons-terrace, each containing eight rooms, near the office of Messrs. NIXON, SON, and BARRIS, 41, Bilk-street.

HOUSE to LET, near the Paramatta Road, containing four rooms, with slate roof and kitchen, standing for four horses, with cart-house, and good well of water in the yard. View of the station and of Burwood Railway Station. Apply to D. McLAUGHLIN, No. 152, South Hind Road, Sydney.

HOUSE to LET, at Randwick, a first-class family residence, of twelve rooms, with bath, and every accommodation for comfort, or private dwelling for invalids, overlooking Coogee Bay and the sea. Apply between 10th November, to WILLIAM ELLIS, 540, George-street.

MARINE VILLA to BE LET, twenty-five minutes from town, containing eight rooms, kitchen, servant's room, and garden, and orchard laid out to high state of cultivation. The house is situated on a precipitous hill, and the view from the garden is high to the state of its station, will be happy to offer easy terms for a period. Apply to Mr. J. H. MACQUEEN, 2nd North.

NORTH SHORE.—To LET, that large Family RESIDENCE, in Fawcett Bay, Allen, a five-room cottage with kitchen, lavatory Bay. Apply to the premises, JOHN GARR.

OFFICES to LET, in Margaret-street.—The Commercial Office, lately in the possession of the Royal Mail Co., and now occupied by the Bull and Butcher, is available for any business, and is well adapted for a considerable possession if required. Apply to GLASHIER, PRATT, and CO.

APARTMENTS VACANT, suitable for a family, at 67, Elizabeth-street, Kent-street.

PUBLIC-HOUSE to LET, that old-established house the Dumbarton Castle, Kent-street.

PUBLIC-HOUSE to LET, corner George and Will streets, Randwick, containing six rooms, cellar, kitchen, out-houses, &c. &c. and good view of the Town Hall. Apply LANGLEY'S Land Agency Offices.

TO LET, 92, Palmer-street, a 4-rooms, Kitchen, in the T. W. FOSTER.

TO LET a HOUSE and Shop, in York-street, suitable for any business. Apply 145, Elizabeth-street.

TO LET, Two Rooms, 550, George street, furnished or not, commanding a fine view of the harbour.

TO LET Butchers SHOP, in Phillip-street. Apply H. VAUGHAN, Kent-street.

TWO YOUNG LADIES can be accommodated with Sleeping Apartments, 341, Pitt-street, South, Terms moderate.

TO BE LET, THE STORE in Pitt-street, North, lately occupied by J. Robinson. Apply to A. SOLIHETZ and CO., Mesquite place.

TO LET, THE STORES and premises of George-Reed, recently in the occupation of Messrs. Hean and Green. Apply to G. W. CLAYMAN, solicitor, 214, Elizabeth-street.

TO LET, LIVERIES, stable, harness, a PADDOCK, with stable, coach-house, adjoining Mr. HARDONK's, Solicitor, lately occupied by Mr. Ardoun, baker-shed, South of the city. Apply to W. H. HILL, 114, Elizabeth-street.

TO LET, SHOPS and PREMISES, newly erected, at the corner of George and Baltimore streets. Apply to EDWIN DAINTRY, solicitor, 65, Elizabeth-street.

TO LET, at Botany-street, Surry Hills, a six-roomed stone & iron house, with detached kitchen, and, yard, good water, and fine view. Apply to ALFRED COOK, architect, 123, William-street.

TO BE LET, THE BON ACCORD SHED corner of Pitt-street and Queen's Wharf, now in the occupation of Anderson, Brothers. Apply to MOREHEAD and YOUNG, O'Connell-street.

TO WORKING-MEN and others—**TO LET**, complete, the HOUSE, in healthy situation, at George-street. Apply to J. R. TREWEE, 309, Lane-st.

TO LET, THE PUBLIC-HOUSE, Cumberland-street, known as the Rock of Coburg, with large and complete. Rent moderate. Apply Mr. DOWLING, Cumberland-street.

TO LET, BY TENDER, THE SHOPS AND PREMISES, lately occupied by Mr. M. J. PARKER, next to Park House. Apply to HOBBERDS and BENDON, solicitors, 114, Elizabeth-street.

TO LET, THE GENERAL WASHINGTON HOTEL, in George-street, doing a good business; rent low, terms liberal. For further particulars apply to W. N. PALMER, proprietor.

TO LET, at Camden-terrace, Newtown, a gated and fenced-in paddock, 1000 square feet, and scullery; stable, coach house, garden, large yard, and good water. Ornithouse span the door. Rent, £65. Apply to JOT and Co., Broadway.

TO LET, HOUSE, in Hills terrace, Riley-street, containing four rooms and a kitchen, with balcony, verandah, spacious yard, and water laid on. Rent moderate. Apply to W. H. HILL, Junior, King-street, or Riley-street, Woolloomooloo.

TO LET, respectively **FURNISHED**, for six months, &c., a lightlly situated **COTTAGE**, with water frontage, containing four rooms; water, gas, and electric light; also a large garden, with flower store and kitchen; of the Post Office; rent moderate. For particulars apply to **FRITCHARD and WILLIAMS**.

TO LET the **ESTATES** known as **ROCKY POINT**, containing about twelve miles from Sydney, the house is commodious, containing twelve large and small bedrooms, a bathroom, a billiard room, a library, a study, a dining room, with out-houses; large garden, and about 150 acres of good grazing and cultivation land. Apply to **Mrs. T. McCULLOCH**, Marine-buildings, Pitt-street.

TO LET, at Balmain, a good stone **HOUSE**, delightfully situated near the **Convent**, containing six and a half acres of land, with a large garden, and within a few minutes' walk of the **Convent Ferry**, containing six bedrooms, kitchen, pantry, wash-house, &c., with good garden, flower garden, and every convenience for a gentleman's residence. Apply to **W. J. SPILLERS**, Bent's-chose, Balmain; or to **Mr. G. BONAMY**, Crook's Ferry.

TO LET, in Elizabeth-street, Paddington, in a delightful and healthy situation, at the back of Woodhouse's, a comfortable **HOUSE**, containing 11 rooms, verandah, and garden in front, with stable, coach-house, hay-loft; kitchen, servants' room, two good bedrooms, and every facility for a gentleman's residence. Apply to **W. TAYLOR**, or 289, Elizabeth-street, Sydney.

TO LET, **DUCK RIVER FARM**, consisting of 150 acres of land, fronting on the north side of the Parramatta River, and between the Parramatta and Duck Creek, the waters of which surround it on all sides, and is well adapted for the purpose of a dairy and sheep and soorlly fence. It is well suited for a gentleman's residence, and is being cleared by the Parramatta River Terminus. Apply to Major **WENTWORTH**, Cumberland-place, Sydney.

SYDNEY MORNING HERALD.
—CASES TAMES OF ADVERTISING.

Two lines or 14 words ... One shilling.
Three lines or 30 ditto ... Two shillings.
Four lines or 40 ditto ... Three shillings.
Eight lines or 64 ditto ... Four shillings.
And 3d. (three pence) per line for each insertion.
Eight words for each line.

* All advertisements under six lines will be charged 3s. to advertiser's account, if booked.
* For Deaths and Births, 1s. 6d. per line, each insertion.
N.B.—Advertisers in the country can remit payment in postage stamps.

SEWERS—Printed and published by JOHN KERR and SONS, at the Office of the "Sydney Morning Herald," Pitt and Roke streets, Thursday, November 24th, 1894.